



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,999	10/24/2001	Derek K. Gauger	GDK-100-B	9338
7590 YOUNG & BASILE, P.C. Suite 624 3001 West Big Beaver Road Troy, MI 48084-3107			EXAMINER VIG, NARESH	
			ART UNIT 3629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/01/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/039,999

Applicant(s)

GAUGER, DEREK K.

Examiner

NARESH VIG

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9, 34, 41 and 52-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9, 34, 41 and 52-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is in reference to communication received 13 August 2008. Addition of claims 56 – 59 is acknowledged. Claims 1 – 6, 9, 34, 41 and 52 – 59 are pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments and concerns are for newly added and amended claims which have been responded to in response to the newly added and the amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 54 recites the limitation " providing for a reply from the plurality of designated review requests by one in parallel from each designated review recipient and in series from all of the designated delegated recipients" in lines 5 - 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 6, 9, 34, 41 and 52 – 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. US Patent 6,507,845 in view of Jenkins US Patent 7,213,030 and Knudson et al. US Patent 5,765,140.

Regarding claim 1, Cohen teaches online collaboration among users involved in a task. Cohen teaches capability to be used for plurality of online tasks. **One of ordinary skill in the art can use Cohen for managing one or more projects.** Cohen does not explicitly recite defining authorized users for a task. However, Jenkins teaches transaction and collaborative management application. Jenkins teaches concept of defining authorized users for a task.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Cohen by adopting teaching of Jenkins to secure access to sensitive project information, restrict input of information to team members only, rksr.

Cohen in view of Jenkins does not explicitly recite plurality of tasks in a project. However, Knudson teaches project management system. Knudson teaches concept for plurality of tasks in a project.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art modify Cohen in view of Jenkins by adopting teachings of Knudson to organize and control plurality of tasks in a project, rksr.

Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for an interactive method for managing at least one project by:

establishing a plurality of information modules in an interactive computer software system (**configuring the computer system by installing software**);

activating at least two or more information modules (**object, procedure, function, applet**) to store (**first module to store information**) and control information (**second module to control information**) for at least two or more of project planning, establishing and tracking project tasks, allowing access to documents and information in any module, providing issue resolution, reviewing project progress, tracking project finances, scheduling and attending meetings, requesting information, reporting project data, and controlling changes to project documents [Cohen, Fig. 1 and disclosure associated with the Figure; Knudson, Fig. 4 and disclosure associated with the Figure];

defining authorized individuals who have access to the interactive computer system providing electronic data interchange for a project [Jenkins, Fig. 2, 29, 4, 5, 6 and disclosure associated with the Figures];

creating an electronic collaboration center as one of the information modules on the computer software system for the time disjointed electronic interaction of authorized individuals on the project [Cohen, Fig. 17, 24 – 27 and disclosure associated with the Figure];

determining access to the collaboration center by the authorized individuals [Jenkins, Fig. 2 and disclosure associated with the Figure];

defining at least one collaboration in the collaboration center associated with the at least one project, the at least one collaboration including a collaboration leader, a collaboration topic, a collaboration status and at least one of a collaboration summary, and a collaboration status statement [Cohen, Jenkins];

allowing the collaboration leader to modify at least one of the collaboration summary, the collaboration status and the collaboration status statement [Knudson, Fig. 4 and disclosure associated with the Figure]; and

accepting input information at the collaboration center from the authorized individuals to facilitate resolution of a project issue related to the collaboration [Cohen, Jenkins].

Regarding claim 2, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for allowing all authorized individuals to perform at least one of review, submit, author, and change data and to interact with other authorized individuals electronically in the collaboration center.

Regarding claim 3, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for notifying all authorized individuals of a change in at least one of the collaboration purpose, the deadline, the collaboration action plan, and input information (Jenkins, an email is automatically generated to the users designated as responsible and discussion

parties for the item notifying them of the critical date).

4, The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of:

forwarding one of a question and an issue involving at least one element of the collaboration to be decided by all authorized project individuals;

Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson does not explicitly teach accepting votes of authorized individuals for the issue on at least one element of the collaboration.

However, it is old and known that in business meetings, team leaders like Project Manager solicits votes from authorized team members to make an educated decision, gauge popularity of a motion, etc.

Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Jenkins in view of Cohen and Knudson has the capability for a team leader to solicit votes from authorized team members to make an educated decision, gauge popularity of a motion, rksr.

Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for
making a decision by the project leader on the issue based in part on the votes;
and

displaying the results of the vote **(communicating result/decision to other team members)**.

Regarding claim 5, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for maintaining and displaying summary of each collaboration.

Regarding claim 6, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for providing the collaboration center with the capability of receiving documents attached to authorized individual responses.

Regarding claim 9, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability using bi-directional electronic mail interaction between authorized individuals and the information modules [Cohen];

the information modules automatically documenting the electronic mail in the appropriate information module by updating the information in the appropriate information module [Cohen]

Also, grouping emails based on the content of the subject line, of, storing emails based on user-id (one of ordinary skill in the assigns project name as a user-id) is old and known technology.

Regarding claim 34, as responded to earlier, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for:

using bi-directional electronic mail interaction between authorized individuals and the information modules;

providing an electronic mail response capability for at least certain of the requests and notifications issued in any of the information modules allowing an authorized user to respond to the request and notification by direct electronic mail reply **(sending emails with hot links and documents is an old and known technology, actions taken after clicking on the hotlink can be documented by the application which was activated by the hotlink);**

the information modules automatically documenting the reply and any documents attached to the reply in the appropriate information module by updating the information in the appropriate information module **(actions taken after clicking on the hotlink can be documented by the application which was activated by the hotlink).**

Regarding claim 41, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for:

providing an electronic notepad for each authorized individual to make personal notes about any item of information in the network relating to the project **(providing a notepad application capability to a user is an old and known technology)** [Cohen, Fig. 9 and disclosure associated with the Figure]; and

attaching the personal notes to the items of information for use only by the authorized individual **(restricting who can view the content of the notepad is an old and known technology).**

Regarding claim 52, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for linking at least two information items of the information module for bi-directional data navigation between the at least two information items.

Regarding claim 53, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for:

defining by a project leader a plurality of organizational categories;
specifying the name of at least one authorized individual as the first request recipient for each defined organization category; and
routing a request for information relating to at least one organizational category from at least one authorized individual to the first request recipient for the organizational category.

Regarding claim 54, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for:

issuing a request for project review by an authorized project individual;
designating a plurality of designated recipients of the review request by an authorized individual;

Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson does not explicitly recite delegated recipient in a project. **However, it is old and known that when a team member goes on a vacation, that team member delegates another person to cover their**

task while the team member is on vacation, and, email applications have capability for providing email forwarding to designated recipient.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability function when there is a designated team member.

Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for:

providing for a reply from the plurality of designated review requests by one in parallel from each designated review recipient and in series from all of the designated delegated recipients;

providing for the delivery of the review request to the designated, recipients in one of:

directly in parallel providing each of the designated recipients with the capability of one of replying to the review request directly, delegating the review request to a designated delegate with the capability for the designated delegate to respond directly to a requestor of the request for review, and delegating the request for review to a designated recipient with the designated recipient's response routed to the designated recipient for review prior to delivery to the requestor;

and to a designated first recipient directly;

providing the first designated recipient of one of replying to the review request for direct delivery, delegating the request for review to a designated delegate with the capability for the designated delegate to respond directly to a requestor of the request for review delegating the request for review to a designated recipient with the

designated recipient's response routed to the first designated recipient for review prior to the requestor; and

serially delegating the review request to a next designated recipient having the same reply and delegating options to deliver a reply to requestor.

Regarding claim 55, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for defining at least one of collaboration purpose, a collaboration action plan and deadline for the collaboration.

Regarding claim 56, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability wherein the linked information modules can be at least two of an information module project plan, an information module task manager, an information module issue manager and an information module collaboration center.

Regarding claim 57, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for:

providing a project plan having a plurality of items;

linking each item to a set of tasks;

linking any item and task to an issue describing a problem and a call for action;

and

linking all of the information and actions associated with the issue to the tasks and the project plan item.

Regarding claim 58, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for linking all of the information and actions associated with the issue to the collaboration.

Regarding claim 59, Cohen in view of Jenkins and Knudson teaches capability for providing a summary view of the information related to the collaboration.

Conclusion

Applicant is required under 37 CFR '1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this office action.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NARESH VIG whose telephone number is (571)272-6810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

November 24, 2008

/Naresh Vig/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3629